

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **19 June 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-28. Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Pleso (USPN 6,009,480, hereinafter “Pleso”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 20 were rejected as being anticipated by Pleso. Applicant respectfully points out that Pleso is distinctively different from the instant application. Specifically, Pleso describes a communication technique **for downloading a device driver for a peripheral device directly from the peripheral device to a computer system, and installing the device driver on the computer system** (see Pleso, col. 2, lines 39-65, and col. 8, lines 30-65).

In contrast, the present invention describes a **universal contextual interface associated with a peripheral device** that can be **invoked by a computer system by executing an instruction of the universal contextual interface** (see FIG. 3, and paragraphs [0026]-[0027] of the instant application). Hence, in the instant application, the computer system communicates with the peripheral device by directly executing interface functions associated with the universal contextual interface of the peripheral device. By doing so, the present inventive computer system **does not have to download and install a device driver for each type of device**. Note that in general a device driver will only enable a computer system that has installed the driver to access a particular type of device but not the universe of all devices (see paragraph [0003] of the instant application).

The applicant respectfully submits that Pleso is different from the instant application in that Pleso requires a device driver to be downloaded and installed to take effect, whereas the universal interface in the instant application is directly invoked by executing interface functions. There is nothing within Pleso, either

explicit or implicit, which suggests invoking the universal contextual interface of the first device by executing at least one instruction of the universal contextual interface.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 20 to clarify that the present invention provides a universal contextual interface associated with a first device for transferring contextual data from the first device to a second device. In particular, the second device **invokes the universal contextual interface of the first device by executing at least one instruction of the universal contextual interface**. These amendments find support in FIG. 3, and paragraphs [0026]-[0028] of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 20 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-19, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 21-28, which depend upon claim 20, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 15 August 2007

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com